Mobility Options Action Team Meeting Notes July 17, 2004

Attendance

Bud Beebe, Garry Bulluck, Sharen Blowers, Diane Kempen, Sharon Edgar, Angel Fandialan, Peter Lenz, Oliver Lindsay, Rick Lyles, John Waterman, Kevin Wisselink

Meeting Overview (25 words or less)

Diane presented some rural mobility options. A discussion on service gaps followed focusing on setting service standards, which could be used to determine when a service gaps exists.

Meeting Notes

- 1. Diane presented some rural mobility options, as follows.
- a. Noting the success of the Rural Electrification Administration in providing electricity in rural areas, Diane suggested that creating a Rural Transportation Administration might achieve similar success in rural transportation.
- b. She also referred to a Minnesota study which indicated that time lost in emergency response on rural roads leads to a higher fatality compared to other roads. A proposed solution is inclusion of rural roads in intelligent transportation systems deployment.
- c. She argued for incentives for cooperation among public officials, private interests and transportation agencies to improve service connectivity.
- d. She proposed revisiting Act 51 to identify changes which might improve the support for these options.
- 2. A synopsis of the Great Plains Rural Initiative on Transportation (GRIT) report was distributed. GRIT has made available a business support system for planning and evaluating the use of voucher payment systems to build transportation opportunities.

3. Gaps in Service.

a. The point was made that service gap (like beauty) is in the eye of the beholder. But there was a consensus that if people can agree on service standards as a matter of public policy, then the standards can be useful in gauging the occurrence of a service gap in a particular situation. For example, if a service meets the applicable standards, it would be characterized a having no service gap. Or if a service does not meet the standards, it would be characterized as having a service gap. A range of standards was also discussed which can be partitioned into an acceptable range, a poor service range and a service gap range. It was pointed out

- that standards could be a function of the trip purpose implying that there could be many sets of standards and many permutations within any set.
- b. John Waterman discussed existence of service gaps in non-motorized transportation such as lack of sidewalks, lack of bike paths and lack of training in schools on non-motorized solutions to transportation needs.
- 4. Follow-up from "Poor Perceptions" discussions Rick Lyles indicated he will be sending materials by email to the team and is requesting feedback.
- 5. Action Item: The gap subcommittee will come up with proposed service standards for the team's review. Peter Lenz accepted the responsibility to pull it together.
- 6. Draft agendas for the August and September meetings were distributed. Next meeting: August 17, 2004, 1pm at CATA.

Action Items

The Mobility Options Team discussed Issue #1.

Issue #2: Gaps in Service

Goal: Improve the perception. Improve the reality/performance.

Action: Survey perceptions of users and non-users.

Provide education and incentives to people, business, and school systems to encourage utilizing mobility options.

The gap subcommittee will come up with proposed service standards for the team's review. Peter Lenz accepted the responsibility to pull it together.

Continued Timeline for task completion is as follows:

August full team discussion and information gathering on Issue #3. **September** presentation and finalizing actions of Issue #3.

Proposed Agenda Topics For Next Meeting

- 1. Full team discussion and information gathering Issue #3, Funding for Mobility Options.
- 2. Draft Agenda for Next Meeting.

Next Meeting Dates

Tuesday, August 17, 2004

1:00-4:00 pm

CATA Board Room, 4615 Tranter Avenue, Lansing MI 48910

Tuesday, September 21, 2004

1:00-4:00 pm

CATA Board Room, 4615 Tranter Avenue, Lansing MI 48910